



## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

INVENTOR(S)

Wu et al.

TITLE

SEMICONDUCTOR POLYMERS AND

**DEVICES THEREOF** 

APPLICATION NO.

10/646,389

**FILED** 

August 22, 2003

CONFIRMATION NO.

4880

**EXAMINER** 

Colleen E. Rodgers

**ART UNIT** 

2813

NOTICE OF ALLOWANCE

January 4, 2006

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.

A2375-US-NP

XERZ 2 00881

## **CERTIFICATE OF EXPRESS MAILING UNDER 37 CFR 1.10**

"Express Mail" Mailing Label Number:

EV 690737985

Date of Deposit:

January 24, 2006

I hereby certify that the attached Fee(s) Transmittal Form, Issue Fee, Publication Fee, Response to Statement of Reasons for Allowance and "Fee Address" Indication Form are being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" Service under 37 CFR 1.10 on the date indicated above and is addressed to the Commissioner For Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

> Lynda S. Kalemba (Typed or Printed Name of Sender)

January 24, 2006

Date

Express Mail" Mailing Label Number: Date of Deposit: EV 690737985 January 24, 2006

In the population of the commissioner for Patents, Mail Stop Issue Fee, P.O. Box 1850, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

By Syndal Kalemba

PATENT

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

INVENTOR(S)

Wu et al.

TITLE

SEMICONDUCTOR POLYMERS AND

**DEVICES THEREOF** 

APPLICATION NO.

10/646,389

**FILED** 

August 22, 2003

CONFIRMATION NO.

4880

**EXAMINER** 

Colleen E. Rodgers

**ART UNIT** 

2813

**ALLOWED** 

January 4, 2006

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.

A2375-US-NP

XERZ 2 00881

## RESPONSE TO STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 Mail Stop Issue Fee

Dear Sir:

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication as to the allowance of the present application.

However, applicants respectfully submit the Statements of Reasons for Allowance are, in and of themselves, inappropriate. It is noted that the reasons for allowance may be set forth in instances in which "... the Examiner believes that the record of the prosecution as a whole does not make clear his or her reasons for allowing a claim or claims." (37 CFR §1.104(e)(2004)). In the present case, applicants believe the

A2375-US-NP XERZ 2 00881 Page -2-

record as a whole does make the reasons for allowance clear and, therefore, no statement by the Examiner is necessary or warranted. Furthermore, the applicants do not necessarily agree with each statement in the reasons for allowance.

Specifically, it has been indicated that the claims are allowed by importing interpretations into the claims in relation to the prior art that results in a potential imprecise and/or inaccurate understanding of the reasons. This places an unwarranted interpretation upon the claims. Such a characterization of the claims does not properly take into account applicants' claimed invention as reflected in the specification and the applicants' responses to the Examiner's office actions.

Therefore, while applicants believe the claims are allowable, applicants do not acquiesce that patentability resides in only the features, exactly as expressed in the claims, nor that each feature is required for patentability.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN, MINNICH & McKEE, LLP

January 24, 2006

Date

Richard M. Klein Reg. No. 33,000

1100 Superior Avenue, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579

(216) 861-5582